HERE AND NOW AND THEN AND THERE: THE CONSTRUCTION OF IMAGINED SPACE IN SAPPHO

S. Elizabeth Needham

A thesis submitted to the faculty at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts in the Department of Classics in the College of Arts and Sciences.

Chapel Hill
2021

Approved by:

Patricia A. Rosenmeyer

Jim O'Hara

Janet Downie

ABSTRACT

S. Elizabeth Needham:
Here and Now and Then and There: The Construction of Imagined Space in Sappho
(Under the direction of Patricia A. Rosenmeyer)

This thesis examines the ways in which Sappho constructs space in frs. 1, 2, 16, 31, 44, 94, and 96 in order to provide a better understanding of how we engage with and are affected by the imagined spaces of Sappho's poetry. I argue that space in Sappho can be broadly divided into three types: purely fictional spaces, which create novel experiences; memory spaces, which bring previous experiences into the present; and mythic spaces, which bring myth into the present as a collective memory. My theoretical framework follows a phenomenological approach that is primarily concerned with the human experience of landscapes—past, present, and future—through the imagination and mediated by deixis. Sappho's poetry and the imaginations of listeners work together in constructing her spaces, which frequently shift between here and now and then and there, thus encouraging listeners to constantly reimagine and re-engage with the spaces of her poetry.

To my friends and family.
I cannot thank you all enough for your support in these very strange times.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION[1]

οἷον τὸ γλυκύμαλον ἐρεύθεται ἄκρῳ ἐπ᾽ ὔσδῳ,
ἄκρον ἐπ᾽ ἀκροτάτῳ, λελάθοντο δὲ μαλοδρόπηες·
οὐ μὰν ἐκλελάθοντ᾽, ἀλλ᾽ οὐκ ἐδύναντ᾽ ἐπίκεσθαι (Sappho 105a)

just as the sweet-apple blushes upon the highest bough,
high upon the very highest; the apple-pickers did not notice it—
no, they did not entirely forget it, but they were unable to reach

Upon reading this fragment of Sappho, a tall tree takes root in our imaginations and at the top hangs a ripening apple, perhaps the only apple left behind after the apple-pickers have done their work. Himerius *Orationes* 9.16 tells us that Sappho compares the girl to an apple and the bridegroom to Achilles; this apple is a metaphor for a young bride. In order to get any meaning out of these words, metaphorical or otherwise, we must envision this apple-tree and the space within which it exists. The world created by this fragment is small; we don't know if there are more apple-trees around, or what time of day it is, or if it's cloudy or sunny. But the apple-tree and its unreachable apple are clear in our imaginations.

The corpus of Sappho's poetry contains a multitude of vivid scenes like this one that come into being through a combination of the speaker's words and our imaginations. Sappho's poetry therefore makes fertile ground for an exploration of our interactions with space in poetry. In this paper I seek to provide a better understanding of how we engage with and are affected by the imagined spaces of Sappho's poetry. I hope to answer the question of how Sappho constructs space in her work and what its effect is. I will first lay out my theoretical framework for

[1] All translations are my own, with text from Campbell 1982. I do not capitalize my translations aside from proper names nor do I add much punctuation as a matter of personal preference. I find the addition of capital letters and their accompanying significance too artificial for my liking in the context of archaic poetry.

interrogating space, which follows a phenomenological approach to the role of the imagination in the experience of space, and I will expand on the role of deixis in listeners' experiences. I will then examine three broad types of imagined space in Sappho's poetry—memory spaces, purely fictional spaces, and mythic spaces—to argue that Sappho engages our imaginations though her vivid descriptors and frequent use of deixis to aid us in constructing her spaces in our minds.

Approaches to space in Sappho have been many and varied throughout the years, stemming at first from an interest in performance context that led scholars to hunt for a connection to real world events within the poetry itself. Arguments for public or private performance and choral or monodic performance have dominated the scholarship. These questions of space were largely shaped by the performative turn in scholarship, which in the field of archaic Greek poetry focused predominately on how and where poetry was performed.[2] As Jo Heirman points out in his 2012 study of space in archaic Greek lyric, however, "the role of space *within* the poems has largely been neglected" (Heirman 2012: 14). Heirman turns to narratology in order to fill this gap, exploring different types of space in lyric as the setting for poetic narrative, which he argues play a symbolic role in a poem's meaning.

Heirman's study is part of the so-called spatial turn in the humanities, which acknowledges space as a social construct and seeks to understand its relationship to power, identity, and the environment. Scholars working within the spatial turn share an interest in space within poetry not just as some hint as to performance context, but as a construct all its own,

[2] E.g., Hallett 1979; Lardinois 1994, 1996, 2001, 2008; and Nagy 2019 favor a choral performance in a public, and thus religious, context, while Merkelbach 1957, Stehle 1981, and Winkler 1981 argue for private context. Power 2019 provides a brief overview of the debate about choral vs. monodic performance of Sappho and raises the possibility that the choral voice in Sappho may not necessarily be reflected in performance, and could in fact be simulated by a monodic singer with the performance occasion entirely imagined.

doing work within the poem to create meaning.[3] Narratology provides a good foundation for examining one way in which space functions within poetry—as the setting for narrative—but Gregory O. Hutchinson reminds us that setting is not all there is to space:

> One should begin by objecting to the idea that each poem has 'a setting': that idea does not do justice to the dynamic and mobile nature of this [lyric] poetry. Firstly, the term is singular, and suggests that each poem has one way in which it is located in space. Secondly, it sounds like something decisive which in a sense precedes the poem; even if we learn about the setting later on, we are to think 'Ah! So the poem is set in...', or 'so that is the setting of the poem'. But these poems evolve in time (Hutchinson 2018: 116).

Indeed, space within Sappho's poetry is ever-evolving, moving within a single poem between here and there, now and then. In light of this difficulty pinning down the nature of space in poetry, I would like to move beyond space as setting to examine instead the act of its construction in Sappho and its relationship with speaker and listener. To do so, I must first establish what it means to construct a space in poetry.

[3] Other recent explorations of space within Sappho's poetry aside from Heirman 2012 include Stehle 2009, Ladianou 2016, and D'Alessio 2018.

II. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

The space that I will be working with in this paper is that which is found in the words of a poem, what a narratologist would call the setting and others might call the world of the poem. Space can be something as specific as the apple-grove of Sappho fr. 2, which is described in great detail, or it can be something a little more vague, like the image of a woman and man sitting across from one another in fr. 31 (they must be sitting somewhere, after all, even if Sappho never tells us exactly where that is). Such spaces, being in fact the construct of a poem, are not real, physical spaces—they exist only through the words of the speaker as they are being spoken (or read, in our case). If these spaces are not real, then they must be unreal, or imaginary. Heirman notes at one point:

> Sometimes the symbolic associations [of a space] become so dominant that we are dealing with imaginary instead of real spaces, i.e. with spaces that are the product of the imagination of the narrator (or speaker) or a character and exist only in his or her mind but not in the actual world (Heirman 2012: 29).

The distinction Heirman makes here is not between what I would consider the real and the imaginary, but between what is realistic and what is not, between verisimilitude and fantasy. In order for a space within poetry to be real in Heirman's terms, it must correspond to a real world location or at least plausibly exist in the real world; the imaginary is thus any space within poetry that cannot be said to exist in the real world. I would argue, however, that we are always dealing with imaginary rather than real spaces in poetry. The space of a poem is never real in the sense that even when referring to a real world location, the space is a construct of the poetry fulfilling some function within it. Any external realities, such as the characteristics of a real sanctuary, are

brought into the imaginary world of the poem by the words of the speaker and the imagination of the listener. In this way, the imagined space exists not only in the imagination of the speaker, as per Heirman, but in our own minds as well. Space within poetry is always in flux, shaped just as much by the listener as by the speaker, both of whom are constantly engaging with and thus reimagining these spaces. Sappho may tell us in fr. 105a that the apple is blushing red—a normal enough phenomenon that most people have seen—but we must imagine it so for it to be true for us.

To understand then how these imaginary spaces are constructed in Sappho's poetry, we must first come to an understanding about what it means for something to be imaginary. For this I rely on Monica Janowski and Tim Ingold's 2012 edited volume *Imagining Landscapes*, which argues that landscapes (here, roughly interchangeable with "spaces") are imagined beyond just their symbolic representation in literature or media, but in their real world perception as well. This approach to the imagination is informed in large part by phenomenology and is primarily concerned with the human experience of landscapes—past, present, and future—through the imagination. Janowski and Ingold suggest that to imagine is "not so much to conjure up images of a reality 'out there', whether virtual or actual, true or false, as to participate from within, through perception and action, in the very becoming of things" (Janowski and Ingold 2012: 3). We are responsible in some part for the creation of that apple, whether we truly see it in the real world or only hear about it from Sappho. The space we see in the real world, Janowski and Ingold argue, is as much a construct of our imaginations as that which we imagine:

> [P]erception and imagination are one: not however because percepts are images, or hypothetical representations of a reality 'out there', but because to perceive, as to imagine, is to participate from within in the perpetual self-making of the world. It is to join with a world in which things do not so much exist as *occur*, each along its own trajectory of becoming (Janowski and Ingold 2012: 14).

Imagination is therefore a facet of reality, embedded in or perhaps even overlaid atop the real world, and it is through the imagination that we experience things. Following this line of thought, that to perceive the real world is to imagine it—to engage with it within our minds—our engagement with imagined spaces is an equally viable means by which we experience things. Rather than the sensory input of, say, sight or touch, the poetry provides all the input needed to imagine and engage with a space. The spaces in Sappho's poetry, although they are a product of the imagination, are as real in our minds as anything, and even allow us to experience things beyond what we could with only "real" sensory input.[4] The role of imagined spaces in Sappho's poetry is thus of great import to their overall effect on listeners and deserving of a more systematic approach. So how do we go about imagining these spaces?

The imagination can generally be divided into two main functions—reproductive and productive imagining—both of which will be important to understanding how spaces in Sappho's poetry are constructed.[5] Reproductive imagining, also known as simple memory recall, reproduces previous experiences in the mind's eye. Productive or constructive imagining, on the other hand, produces new experiences, through either a modification of a previous experience or a novel combination of multiple previous experiences.[6] We might say the first produces fact and the second fiction, but fact and fiction are, as Janowski and Ingold argue, one in the same when

[4] E.g., the movement between time and space within a single poem such as in fr. 2 would be impossible for listeners to experience physically within the same timeframe as it takes to listen to the poem.

[5] The ancient conception of the imagination as it relates to *phatasia* and *mimesis*, while certainly at the root of many modern theoretical approaches to the imagination, will not be the focus of this paper. The modern theories behind my approach to Sappho provide ample room to explore space in a paper of this length.

[6] There are many different ways in which I could discuss the functions of the imagination, and even more terms I could choose from. I have at last settled on "productive" and "reproductive," as these are the two most broad functions of the imagination that are relevant to my argument. These terms reflect the ideas, if not the exact terminology, of Janowski and Ingold 2012. See also the introduction of Castagnoli and Ceccarelli 2019 for discussion of the myriad ways in which we conceptualize the imagination.

dealing with the imagination. That which has been reproduced and that which is newly produced are inextricably entwined; both functions of the imagination are integral to the experience of spaces both real and imagined. Janowski and Ingold rightly caution against attempts to distinguish too strictly between different types of imagined landscapes on the basis of their imaginative origins. I quote at length to preserve the flow of their explanation:

> According to one commonly accepted meaning of the term, 'to imagine' means to conjure up, in the mind, or perhaps in words and images, things or happenings that are not actually present to the senses… The novelist might imagine a landscape that could conceivably have existed but which is nevertheless of his own invention… We could, if we were so inclined, distinguish landscapes of memory, of design, of fiction and of fantasy. But we could, just as well, adduce all sorts of reasons why these distinctions cannot be watertight. What work of fiction, for example, is not informed by its author's memories and anticipations? And when have these memories and anticipations not been infused by – and in turn infused – our dreams and fantasies? (Janowski and Ingold 2012: 4)

The reproductive and productive functions of the imagination are interdependent; one must reproduce some prior understanding of what an apple is in order to produce an image of it turning red at the top of a tree. Neither function requires the actual presence of a ripening apple at that moment in order to imagine what Sappho tells us is happening, precisely because each facet of the imagination works to fill in what the other lacks. Janowski and Ingold are right in their caution, but for the sake of this paper I am inclined to make some distinctions between different types of imagined spaces, slippery though they may be.

Integral to the construction and experience of space in Sappho is deixis, the linguistic system of reference which locates events, states, or objects within space and time through the use of spatial deictic markers—pronouns, pronominal adjectives, and spatial adverbs—and temporal deictic markers—tense, aspect, and temporal adverbs. Deictics can only function relative to a deictic center (or *origo*), typically the first-person speaker of I, here, now, around which all other

deictic markers are oriented. Nancy Felson, in her introduction to a special issue of *Arethusa* on the poetics of deixis, explains well the contextual complexity of deixis:[7]

> Deictics bridge the tangible world of reality and the abstract world of fantasy. As indexical signs that point to objects or referents with which they are (or pretend to be) contiguous, their sense is not determined by any inherent semantic property and cannot be ascertained by consulting a lexicon. Rather, to decipher their meaning and construe their reference, the interpreter must, at the least, first calibrate the parameters of the context, optimally by being at the actual utterance as an eye- or ear-witness, or else by imagined presence (Felson 2004: 253–54).

Deixis is generally discussed in three main types: ocular deixis, which points to objects outside of a text; anaphoric deixis, which points to the text itself; and imagination-oriented deixis, which points "imaginatively to objects brought into existence by the very act of pretending to designate them" (Felson 2004: 254).[8] Most relevant to the construction of imagined space in which we are not physically present is this last type, imagination-oriented or fictional deixis. By pointing to an apple high atop a tree, Sappho in essence creates both apple and tree, and regardless of whether we are in the presence of a real apple-tree, our gaze is drawn upwards in this imagined space to this apple. As Felson points out, all deixis has "the pragmatic effect of making audiences work" (Felson 2004: 254); the use of deictic markers pushes us to engage the imagination and construct a space as it is described.

The points of reference established by the use of deixis scaffold the space and allow listeners to engage as they track movement between the points. The deictic center around which these points are oriented is not necessarily fixed and may shift to a different speaker or to an

[7] Felson 2004, especially 253–58 and her glossary (445–47), provides an accessible overview for those unfamiliar with the concept of deixis and a concise refresher for the rest of us.

[8] These three types were identified by Karl Bühler in his 1934 *Sprachtheorie*, which was translated into English in 1990 and reprinted with new introductory material in 2011. Bühler is most well-known for his work on gestalt psychology and his organon model of communication (see Werner Abraham's preface in Bühler 2011: xiiv–xlvii for further introduction). In part two of his *Sprachtheorie*, "The Deictic Field of Language and Deictic Words" (93–166), Bühler provides a detailed discussion of his three categories of deixis, which still play a major role in modern approaches to the study of deixis.

entirely different time or place. Listeners experience an "imaginary displacement" as a result of such a deictic shift; the speaker creates a new deictic center around a different person/space/time, and listeners must understand deictic coordinates as relative to this new center (Felson 2004: 259). Felson adds of the poetic effect deictic shift may have:

> In general, [deictic] displacements challenge audiences to establish, by inference, the pragmatic/contextual anchoring of the discourse in order to apprehend what is not self-evident… The resultant participation in the process of making meaning intensifies their response to what they hear, making them work harder and therefore become all the more engaged. In this way, displaced deixis may offer, as one of its poetic consequences, ample compensation for the loss of original immediacy (Felson 2004: 260).

The frequent shift in Sappho between here and now and then and there encourages listeners to constantly reimagine the spaces Sappho describes. The contrast between these different spaces and between the spaces of the poem and the real world location of the listener makes it impossible for them to forget that they are using their imagination, in many ways heightening their experience of the poem. It is similarly impossible for listeners to forget that a change in speaker is purely a result of their imaginations; unlike in a written format, the speaker in a performance can never truly disappear, even when taking on a new persona. These and other such effects of deixis will be explored further in later sections.[9]

Armed now with an understanding of the effect of deixis on the imagination and the role of the imagination in constructing and experiencing spaces, we may still pause and ask—what does it matter? What if Sappho's performance context *is* reflected in her poetry and all the deixis points towards the real world? Would the real circumstances of performance context erase the effect of imagined spaces? My obvious answer is no, they would not. Even when real performance context is referenced in a poem, the imagination plays a role in the construction and

[9] Bühler goes further to distinguish between three different types of possible imagined displacement which will not be explored in this paper. See Bühler 2011: 149–52 and Felson 2004: 260.

experience of that space, and since we are uncertain about real performance context, I will focus my inquiry on the role of the imagination regardless of where or when or how Sappho's poetry was performed.

For the purposes of this paper I have identified three broad types of imagined space in Sappho's poetry, keeping in mind the fact that any number of these types may be present in a single poem and that there is a certain amount of overlap between them. These are by no means definitive categories; Janowski and Ingold are right to point out that watertight categories of imagined space are truly impossible to create. Though the categories I have drawn will certainly shift as we make our way through them, I nevertheless believe that they will provide a helpful framework for analyzing Sappho's construction of space. I will examine each of the three types—memory spaces, purely fictional spaces, and mythic spaces—in turn to demonstrate the ways in which Sappho constructs these spaces and, through the use of deixis, locates them relative to the speaker within the poem and to performance context outside of it—by which I mean not the original specific circumstances of performance but the zero degree deictic space of I, here, now in the real world in which a poem is performed.

III. MEMORY SPACES

I will begin with the space of memory. Rather than a simple narration of past events, a memory space is a reproductive imagining of the past; previous experiences are brought into the present by the act of imagining. Past time is the most important aspect of a memory space; temporal deixis—past tense verbs or other deictic markers—is often used to signal that the space we are constructing in our minds is based on a memory. Though the memory may belong to another, its presentation as a memory allows us to engage with it in a way that feels reproductive, even if we are not truly reproducing experiences from our own memories. It is important to note that although the space is based on memory, this does not mean that it is free of purely fictional elements. As I said in the previous section, reproductive and productive imagining are two sides of the same coin and it is sometimes difficult to determine where one ends and the other begins. The key feature of memory space then is its self-determination as a memory through explicit references to past events, sometimes with a verb of remembering. I will turn first to the temporally-complicated fr. 1.

Fr. 1 famously presents the speaker's previous interactions with Aphrodite in a way that blurs the lines between past, present, and future. The speaker begins in the here and now of the imagined space with the present tense "I beg of you" (2: λίσσομαί σε), asking Aphrodite to come "here" (5: ἀλλὰ τυίδ' ἔλθ'). This space quickly becomes a memory space when the speaker switches to the aorist tense: "if ever at another time you lent your ear, hearing my voice from afar" (5–7: αἴ ποτα κἀτέρωτα / τὰς ἔμας αὔδας ἀίοισα πήλοι / ἔκλυες). The use of both ποτα and κἀτέρωτα distinguishes emphatically between the past and the present. A series of aorist verbs

follows, firmly establishing the memory space in the past. Things become muddled, however, once Aphrodite arrives in the memory:

> ἤρε᾽ ὄττι δηῦτε πέπονθα κὤττι
> δηῦτε κάλημμι,
> κὤττι μοι μάλιστα θέλω γένεσθαι
> μαινόλᾳ θύμῳ· τίνα δηῦτε πείθω
> ἄψ σ᾽ ἄγην ἐς ϝὰν φιλότατα; τίς σ᾽, ὦ
> Ψάπφ᾽, ἀδικήει; (15–20)
>
> you asked what now again I had suffered and why
> now again I was calling,
> and what I wished most to happen for myself
> in my maddened heart: ‘whom do I now again persuade
> to lead you back to her love? Who wrongs you,
> Sappho?’

Reported speech shifts to direct speech in line 18 when the speaker, who names herself Sappho, takes up the voice of Aphrodite to address herself in a reproduction of an earlier conversation. The change to present tense in both the indirect and direct questions blurs the line between the speaker’s past and present even further, bringing the past that much closer to the present in this memory space. Aphrodite then offers a series of simple conditions with future indicatives (21: διώξει, 22: δώσει, 23: φιλήσει) which forms a prediction of the future to the effect of “if she’s not interested now, she will be”—though it is unclear if it will be the speaker who eventually catches the woman’s eye. Purves argues that this lack of direct object, combined with repetition of vocabulary, generalizes the conditions and gives them a “somewhat gnomic quality” (Purves 2014: 180). These conditions are part of the direct speech embedded in the memory space of this fragment; at that time in the past, Aphrodite points towards the speaker’s future. If we step back from the memory space, however, we find that these conditions—given in the future tense at a past time—actually point towards the present tense of the poem’s performance as well as the

future beyond it.[10] This blending of times in fr. 1 muddles the temporality of the memory space, almost merging it with the present.[11] As Giambattista D'Alessio points out, the "deictic spatial and temporal references are 'moveable', in that no identifying link to a defined context is provided" (D'Alessio 2018: 36); all these deictics only have meaning relative to one another.[12] In the final stanza we leave the memory behind and return to the present tense, with "now" (25: ἔλθε μοι καὶ νῦν) once again locating us in the present and implying a difference in time between the "now" of this present space and the "then" of the memory space. Despite this mixture of times, past tense markers serve their purpose to demarcate a clear memory space within this fragment.

The effect of the repeated δηὖτε (15, 16, 18) in fr. 1 has drawn particular interest from scholars. As a crasis of δὴ and αὖτε, δηὖτε performs two important functions, laid out most eloquently by Anne Carson: "*Dē* places you in time and emphasizes that placement: *now. Aute* intercepts 'now' and binds it into a history of '*thens*'" (Carson 1986: 119). In this way the memory space of δηὖτε is truly a reliving of previous experiences in the present. Pauline LeVen writes of δηὖτε poems:

> By presenting the feeling as a repetition of a past event, the speaker gives us… the impression of reflecting on an echo. The pragmatics of the δηὖτε are thus best described as implicitly conspiratorial. Even those who have not experienced this sort of thing before know from the rhetoric that they are meant to imagine they have done so (LeVen 2018: 229).

[10] Purves 2014: 180 notes the generalizing quality of these conditions: "Although these conditions are simple, thereby implying specificity, the repetition of vocabulary and lack of direct object also generalises them, giving them a somewhat gnomic quality."

[11] Stehle 2009 argues that the ποτα in line 5 is indicative of what she considers to be blurred mythic-memory time.

[12] Schmitz 2013: 93 offers fr. 1 as the perfect example of "die narrative Mitarbeit des Publikums" or the audience's narrative collaboration. No story, he argues, can give all the details, and lyric in particular leaves many holes that the audience has to fill, which makes it particularly well-suited for reperformance. The speaker's avoidance of specifics and her use of generalizing statements make the audience work to construct the space within the framework provided by the deictics.

While LeVen's argument deals specifically with the acousmatic condition of the lyric listener, her view of the pragmatics of δηῦτε holds true for the full imagined experience of the listener as well.[13] By presenting themselves as memories, the spaces in fr. 1 and poems like it allow listeners to relive and yet experience for the first time the events in the memory space, thus enhancing the imagined experience.[14]

The fragments that remain for me to discuss in this section are all what could be considered *Trennungsgedichte* ("separation poems"), in which the memory of a woman no longer present is taken out and polished. Rather than a sense of continual repetition, as in fr. 1, the memory spaces in frs. 16, 94, and 96 convey a sense of separation from the event even as it is being relived. The speaker of fr. 1 is sure to follow the same steps of love again and again in the future, as Aphrodite promises, but the speakers of the following fragments can only look to the past.

In fr. 16 Sappho presents a priamel arguing that "the most beautiful thing" to a person is simply "whatever they love" (3–4: ἔμμεναι κάλλιστον, ἔγω δὲ κῆν᾽ ὄττω τις ἔραται). After providing Helen as evidence for this argument, the speaker offers her own most beautiful thing—Anaktoria, a woman who has gone away:

> . .]με νῦν Ἀνακτορί[ας ὀ]νέμναις᾽
> οὐ] παρεοίσας·
> τᾶ]ς κε βολλοίμαν ἔρατόν τε βᾶμα
> κἀμάρυχμα λάμπρον ἴδην προσώπω
> ἢ τὰ Λύδων ἄρματα κἀν ὅπλοισι
> πεσδομ]άχεντας (15–20)

[13] LeVen 2018: 223 describes the acousmatic condition as "the overwhelming presence of sound in the absence of sight, touch, and anything else."

[14] Schmitz 2013: 99 argues that Sappho here offers listeners the chance to experience an alternate reality through the use of the imagination ("Sowohl die auf Wiederaufführung berechnete Offenheit des Gedichts als auch der hybride Status seiner Sprecherrolle zwischen Realität und Imagination scheinen mir wichtige Hinweise darauf zu geben, dass Sapphos Aphroditelied… ein Versuch [ist], den Rezipienten einen alternativen Weltentwurf in der Imagination anzubieten und ihnen zu erlauben").

…has reminded me now of Anaktoria,
who is not here;
I would rather see her beloved step
and the shining flash of her face
than the Lydians' chariots and armed
infantry

Although this memory space is only a small part of the fragment, it is another good example of a past experience being brought into the present through reproductive imagining. There are actually no temporal deictics here to indicate a memory space, but the use of ἀναμιμνήσκω signals the possibility for a memory to appear. Anaktoria is said to be not here in the present moment (15–16: νῦν…[οὐ] παρεοίσας), implying that she was "here" at some time in the past and as such the descriptions of her movement and appearance are but reproductions of Anaktoria while she was present with the speaker in the past.[15] Her "beloved step" (17: ἔρατον βᾶμα) and the "shining flash of her face" (18: κἀμάρυχμα λάμπρον… προσώπω) are only present in the context of the memory space, but the vivid recollection of these movements aids in our imagining of her presence.[16] We are invited to imagine Anaktoria as she was, bringing her into the present through the memory space.

Sappho's close attention to the role of memory in this fragment is apparent; Helen's forgetting of her child and parents (10–11: κωὐδὲ παῖδος οὐδὲ φίλων τοκήων / πάμπαν ἐμνάσθη) contrasts sharply with the speaker's careful remembrance of Anaktoria (15: . .]με νῦν Ἀνακτορί[ας ὀ]νέμναις᾽)—a contrast made all the more sharp with the juxtaposition of the verbs

[15] As Stehle 2009 notes: "What is left implicit in Helen's story is her being violently separated from the one she loved, and what is left implicit in Sappho's story of loving Anaktoria is that they were once together."

[16] Lardinois 2008: 82–84 and Capra 2019: 192 reiterate the argument of Bierl 2003 that ἔρατον βᾶμα and κἀμάρυχμα λάμπρον προσώπω refer to specifically the absent Anaktoria's movements while dancing. Lardinois in particular pushes for a choral reading of fr. 16, whereby choral performance of this song reminds others of Anaktoria and her presumed earlier performances.

μιμνήσκω and ἀναμιμνήσκω.[17] Anne Pippin Burnett describes Sappho's use of memory space as a "doctrine of memory… a disciplined mental process which, by reconstructing past actions in a certain way, kept one fit for the best that the present might propose" (Burnett 1983: 290). The act of remembering serves as a way to replace grief with joy after separation, by methodically constructing a memory space. As Sarah Olsen states, Sappho "brings the work of imaginative prompting to the fore" in her description of the absent Anaktoria, "using absence and isolation to create space for reflection" by the audience (Olsen 2019: 292). Listeners must put in the work to imagine Anaktoria's movement as it exists in the gaps between "description and action, script and performance, cultural conditioning and individual kinesthetic experience" (Olsen 2019: 292). Only once listeners have filled in the gaps with their own imaginations will the memory space come into being.

There is a similarly brief memory space in fr. 96, taking up only a few lines, in which the speaker comforts Atthis, who misses a woman who has gone away:

]Σαρδ .[. .]
πόλ]λακι τυίδε [ν]ῶν ἔχοισα
ὡσπ . [. . .] . ώομεν, . [. . .] . . χ[. .]-
σε θέαι σ᾽ ἰκέλαν ἀριγνώται,
σᾶι δὲ μάλιστ᾽ ἔχαιρε μόλπαι (1–5)

…Sardis…
often turning her thoughts hither
(she honored?) you as if you were
like a well-known goddess
and she used to take the most pleasure in your song[18]

τυίδε (2) reinforces the separation of the woman from Atthis; she did not only turn her thoughts to the present location in a spatial sense, but in a temporal sense as well back to the time when

[17] See also Capra 2019: 191, who takes note of this "interesting dialectic between memory and oblivion."

[18] The first three lines are particularly troublesome; I follow Campbell's reconstruction.

the woman was on Lesbos. The verb of line 3 is uncertain, but more sure is the imperfect ἔχαιρε of line 5 that describes what was perhaps a repeated occurrence in the past.[19] Atthis' μόλπαι (5) is more accurately a song and dance together, which further enlivens this memory space.[20] This memory space dissolves almost as soon as it is formed, the "now" of the next line (6: νῦν δὲ) dismissing it to move onwards. Memory and separation, however, remain themes even outside of the memory space:

> πόλλα δὲ ζαφοίταισ', ἀγάνας ἐπι-
> μνάσθεισ' Ἄτθιδος ἰμέρῳ
> λέπταν ποι φρένα κ[ᾶ]ρ[ι σᾶι] βόρηται (15–17)
>
> while wandering often to and fro, having remembered
> gentle Atthis with longing,
> her delicate heart is surely consumed because of your fate

Although the woman is wandering in a purely fictional space of the sort which will be discussed in detail in the next section, the use of ἐπιμιμνήσκομαι here invites listeners to imagine that the woman is herself caught up in a memory space characterized by her longing for a time past.

The final poem I will discuss in this section, fr. 94, introduces a memory space through past verb tenses in the very beginning of what survives. The speaker, again named Sappho, tells us that a woman was leaving her (2: κατελίμπανεν) and then moves into direct speech (3: ἔειπέ). The speaker acts out her exchange with the woman, much like in fr. 1, playing both speaking roles in order to bring this past event more effectively into the present performance and construct the memory space:

> τεθνάκην δ' ἀδόλως θέλω·
> ἄ με ψισδομένα κατελίμπανεν
> πόλλα καὶ τόδ' ἔειπέ [μοι·

[19] Stehle 2009 argues that the imperfect ἔχαιρε creates the same indefinite temporal sense here as ποτα does elsewhere in Sappho.

[20] Lardinois 2008: 82–86 argues that memory in Sappho's poetry is connected to and kept alive through the oral performance of songs.

ʽὤιμ᾽ ὡς δεῖνα πεπ[όνθ]αμεν,
Ψάπφ᾽, ἦ μάν σ᾽ ἀέκοισ᾽ ἀπυλιμπάνω.᾽
τὰν δ᾽ ἔγω τάδ᾽ ἀμειβόμαν (1–6)

‘and honestly I wish I were dead’
she, crying much, was leaving
me, and said this to me:
‘oh, what terrible things we have suffered,
Sappho—truly I leave you unwillingly!’
and I responded with these words:

The use of direct speech enlivens the memory space and connects it more closely with the present. Within the direct speech of this first memory space another memory space is embedded, that of the time the woman spent with the speaker before her departure:

ʽχαίροισ᾽ ἔρχεο κἄμεθεν
μέμναισ᾽, οἶσθα γὰρ ὤς σε πεδήπομεν·
αἰ δὲ μή, ἀλλά σ᾽ ἔγω θέλω
ὄμναισαι [. . . .] . [. . .] . . αι
. . [ ]καὶ κάλ᾽ ἐπάσχομεν᾽ (7–11)

‘go, fare well and remember
me, for you know how we cared for you;
if not, however, I wish to remind
you…
…and the good times we used to have’

The imperfect ἐπάσχομεν (11) introduces this second memory space of “the good times,” which the speaker, still in direct speech, details in what follows with the aorist tense (14: περεθήκαο, 17: ἔβαλες, 20: ἐξαλείψαο). As Burnett so neatly states, “[the exhortation to remember] is followed by a demonstration of memory in action, offered fictionally to the senses of the girl, and by the poem as a whole to ours” (Burnett 1979: 18). The speaker engages the listeners’ senses of sight, smell, touch—and sound, if ψόφος in line 28 is part of this poem and not another—in her description of the second memory space, providing plenty of sensory input

for the imagined space.[21] The framing of this fragment gives us two distinct memory spaces: the first is constructed by the speaker's recounting of a woman's departure and the second by the remembrance of a time before that.

[21] Ladianou 2016: 346 notes that "the construction through memory of the eutopic space focuses on its visualization" and other synesthetic descriptors. See also Bierl 2016 on the synesthetic quality of Sapphic poetry.

IV. PURELY FICTIONAL SPACES

Now that we have explored the peculiarities of memory spaces, I turn to purely fictional spaces, that is, those that are the result of productive imagining, which can create a novel combination of previous experiences or experiences that are themselves entirely novel. In naming this kind of space "purely fictional" I do not mean to imply that it is any more removed from reality than myth- or memory-based spaces, but to distinguish between imagined spaces based heavily on some previous experience or knowledge and those which are novel. The most notable feature that distinguishes purely fictional spaces from other kinds of space is the lack of indication from the speaker that the space is a memory or, as I will elaborate upon in the next section, a myth. These spaces have been considered by some to be "real spaces," since they often refer to actual or plausible physical locations in the real world;[22] given that they are constructs of the poetry experienced through the imagination, even these "real" spaces can be considered fictional for my purposes.

The vast majority of Sappho's poetry contains purely fictional space; even the fragments from the previous section that contain memory spaces also make use of purely fictional space to constitute the present. Although there is so much material to choose from, I have decided to use the more complete frs. 2 and 31 to illustrate the construction of purely fictional spaces.

Fragment 2 contains perhaps the most detailed description of space in Sappho's poetry and provides an excellent example of a purely fictional space:

> δεῦρύ μ᾽ ἐκ Κρήτας ἐπ[ὶ τόνδ]ε ναῦον
> ἄγνον, ὄππ[ᾳ τοι] χάριεν μὲν ἄλσος

[22] See, e.g., Lardinois 1996: 165 on the temple described in Sappho fr. 2 as a real location on Lesbos.

μαλί[αν], βῶμοι δὲ τεθυμιάμε-
νοι [λι]βανώτῳ
ἐν δ᾽ ὕδωρ ψῦχρον κελάδει δι᾽ ὕσδων
μαλίνων, βρόδοισι δὲ παῖς ὀ χῶρος
ἐσκίαστ᾽, αἰθυσσομένων δὲ φύλλων
κῶμα κατέρρει·
ἐν δὲ λείμων ἱππόβοτος τέθαλεν
ἠρίνοισιν ἄνθεσιν, αἰ δ᾽ ἄηται
μέλλιχα πνέοισιν [
[ ]
ἔνθα δὴ σὺ . . . . ἔλοισα Κύπρι
χρυσίαισιν ἐν κυλίκεσσιν ἄβρως
ὀμμεμείχμενον θαλίαισι νέκταρ
οἰνοχόαισον (1–16)

hither to me from Crete to (this here?) holy
temple, where is the graceful grove
of apple-trees, and altars smoke
with frankincense
and wherein cold water babbles through the branches
of the apple-trees, and the entire place is shaded
by roses, and from fluttering leaves
enchanted sleep pours down;
and wherein a horse-grazing meadow flourishes
with spring blossoms, and gentle
winds blow…
…
there, Cypris, take…
into golden cups gracefully
pour nectar mixed with
festivities

The speaker locates the fictional space as her zero-degree deictic space with δεῦρύ and, if we accept Campbell's reconstruction, the emphatic τόνδε (1). The smoking frankincense and the sight of the grove and altars create a realistic space, even in the absence of real sensory input. The next two stanzas add on to the description of the grove, expanding the fictional space from within. These descriptions of sight, sound, smell, and touch provide the sensory input which is absent in the real world but needed to construct the space. We make up for this lack of real sensory input by imagining the smell of incense or the touch of a gentle breeze.

In the final stanza the speaker again summons Aphrodite, but this time the goddess is not called to appear "here" (δεῦρύ) as in the first line but "there" (ἔνθα).[23] ἔνθα likely works as a demonstrative to refer to the space most recently described, namely the apple-grove and meadow, and parallels the ἐν δ᾽ at the beginning of the previous two stanzas. But why not use δεῦρύ again, if the speaker has not moved from the original location to which she called Aphrodite? This switch in adverb seems to indicate some level of separation between the "here" at the beginning of the poem and the "there" at the end; it would almost appear that throughout the description of the previous two stanzas the speaker has distanced herself from the place to which she calls Aphrodite.[24] Perhaps a second purely fictional space has emerged over the past two stanzas, or perhaps the speaker has faded away from the space herself, caught up in constructing the apple-grove. D'Alessio sees the summons in the final stanza

> either as a transposition of a psychological/religious experience of divine epiphany, as a poetic fiction that may be built upon an otherwise non-fictional performative context, or as part of a situation whose reality resides entirely in the words of the text itself (D'Alessio 2018: 36–37).

Whether or not this fragment was meant to represent the experience of divine epiphany, it has implications for both imagined and real spaces. If fr. 2 really was performed in a real sanctuary that matches some of the fragment's descriptions, that reality would be augmented by the imagined space. If we leave aside performance context to examine the space as it exists within

[23] See D'Alessio 2018: n. 15 for discussion of the adverb ἔνθα as anaphoric here. I am choosing to follow D'Alessio and, e.g., Ladianou 2016 in reading ἔνθα as a spatial adverb, but there is the possibility that its use here is temporal—"thereupon" or "then"—placing the final stanza as the next step in the fragment's sequence of events. No commentators seem to have noted this possibility, and I find it more likely that ἔνθα is a spatial adverb here, given that the previous two stanzas begin with ἐν δὲ (5, 9).

[24] There is of course interest in the possible existence of a real sanctuary that Sappho is referring to here, such as in Lardinois 1996, but whether the sanctuary described really existed at one point is consequential only in the instance that this poem was performed there, in which case the speaker's location both inside and out of the poem would be the same and the descriptions of the space would overlap with the real sensory input provided by the location. I am, however, inclined to follow Yatromanolakis 2004 and D'Alessio 2018 in pushing back against such readings that suggest real performance context may be extracted from the text.

this fragment, it remains unclear whether the speaker, and thus listeners along with her, have moved from "here" to "there" while travelling through the apple-grove and meadow. This apparent movement from place to place would be impossible outside of the purely fictional space. Regardless of the performance context of fr. 2, the speaker's detailed descriptions are brought to life in the imaginations of listeners as a purely fictional space.

Unlike fr. 2, fr. 31 has little in the way of description of the space, but even without much detail we are invited to construct an imagined space. In the opening lines, Sappho provides a generalized description of something the speaker sees (or has seen before):

> φαίνεταί μοι κῆνος ἴσος θέοισιν
> ἔμμεν᾽ ὤνηρ, ὅττις ἐνάντιός τοι
> ἰσδάνει καὶ πλάσιον ἆδυ φωνεί-
> σας ὐπακούει
> καὶ γελαίσας ἰμέροεν, τό μ᾽ ἦ μὰν
> καρδίαν ἐν στήθεσιν ἐπτόαισεν·
> ὠς γὰρ ἔς σ᾽ ἴδω βρόχε᾽, ὤς με φώναι-
> σ᾽ οὐδ᾽ ἒν ἔτ᾽ εἴκει (1–8)
>
> that man seems to me to be
> equal to the gods, whoever sits
> across from you and listens nearby
> to your sweet voice
> and charming laugh; it really set
> my heart trembling in my breast,
> for whenever I look at you briefly, it is not
> possible for me to speak even one thing

This image of a woman and man sitting across from one another is the foundation of this purely fictional space, with the imagined sensory input of the woman's voice and laughter filling out more of the space beyond the image of their initial positioning. Further details—Where are they? What are they sitting on?—are unnecessary for the construction of the space; only a few foundational details are required. The generalizing force of ὅττις (2) and the use of the present tense φαίνεταί (1), ἰσδάνει (3), and ὐπακούει (4) in the opening locate this fragment temporally

in a general present: the scene has taken place before, as indicated by the aorist indicative ἐπτόαισεν (6), and presumably it will happen again in the future, as indicated by the present general condition in the following lines (7–8: ὡς γὰρ…ἴδω… / …εἴκει).[25] This space is not quite a memory by my standards, though one could certainly argue otherwise; the generalizing statements are broken only by the aorist indicative in line 6, which implies "an anchoring in (what is presented as) an actual event" at some time in the past (D'Alessio 2018: 60). Despite the fact that this event is implied to have happened before, I find the present force of the generalizations too strong to locate the opening image in a memory space without a verb of remembering to introduce it. Instead, listeners are left with the impression that the event is taking place at the very moment of performance, imagining the addressee and a man sitting across from one another in a fictional space.

The rest of the poem quickly turns to the bodily experience of the speaker, presented as a recurring experience with present (11: ὄρημμ', 11–12: ἐπιρρόμβεισι, 14: ἄγρει, 15: ἔμμι, 16: φαίνομ') or perfect (9: ἔαγε, 10: ὑπαδεδρόμηκεν) tense verbs:

> ἀλλὰ κὰμ μὲν γλῶσσά <μ'> ἔαγε, λέπτον
> δ' αὔτικα χρῷ πῦρ ὑπαδεδρόμηκεν,
> ὀππάτεσσι δ' οὐδ' ἒν ὄρημμ', ἐπιρρόμ-
> βεισι δ' ἄκουαι,
> κὰδ δέ μ' ἴδρως κακχέεται, τρόμος δὲ
> παῖσαν ἄγρει, χλωροτέρα δὲ ποίας
> ἔμμι, τεθνάκην δ' ὀλίγω 'πιδεύης
> φαίνομ' ἔμ' αὔτ[ᾳ (9–16)
>
> but my tongue has broken, a thin
> fire has run suddenly beneath my skin,
> I see not one thing with my eyes, my
> ears buzz,
> sweat pours down me, a trembling
> seizes me all over, I am greener
> than grass—I seem to myself to be

[25] Ferrari 2010: 183 also points towards the generalizing force of κῆνος with ὅττις as "blurring [the man's] outlines into an evanescent symbolic figure."

little short of dying

The speaker's body almost forms a space of its own, as the site of all these imagined sensations—and they must be imagined. As a number of commentators have pointed out, it would be impossible for the speaker to actually perform this song while incapable of speaking.[26] Since the speaker is very obviously not experiencing these symptoms in the present moment if she is currently performing the song, it is again left to the listeners to imagine that she is "greener than grass." The speaker's imagined symptoms complicate the process of viewing this performance; the audience must put in the work to overlay the description of the speaker's symptoms atop her performance. The relationship between speaker and audience becomes even more complicated when the speaker herself becomes an observer—she has moved from "he seems to me" (1: φαίνεταί μοι) at the beginning of the fragment to "I seem to myself" (16: φαίνομ᾽ ἔμ᾽) at the end. This second purely fictional space is now almost an inverse of the first; whereas the speaker observes the man's and woman's reactions in the first space, as she begins to observe her own reactions the second space takes shape. The camera, so to speak, begins to turn around and pan out until the speaker is viewing herself from the outside. Carson again offers an eloquent description of Sappho's work here:

> We see her senses empty themselves, we see her Being thrown outside its own center where it stands observing her as if she were grass or dead" (Carson 2002: 2003).

The speaker's out-of-body experience more closely aligns her with the audience; she sees what we see and imagine from our perspective, which is her body breaking down from the inside out. While the second space is filled with the details of the speaker's breakdown, the opening space is produced less by detailed description from the speaker than it is by our own productive

[26] See, e.g., D'Alessio 2018: 60.

imagining of the space based on the knowledge that there are, at least, a woman and a man seated in some way in some place. Fr. 31 stretches the possibilities of a purely fictional space, presenting an alternate imagining of the speaker that contradicts the performance itself.

V. MYTHIC SPACES

The final kind of imagined space I will examine in this paper is mythic space, that which contains recognizable allusions to myth. This kind of space could be considered purely fictional, since it is not presented to be a memory and typically provides a previously unexplored angle on myth; at the same time, however, knowledge of myth functions almost like a collective memory and these spaces are often constructed in the past tense. Mythic spaces lack much reference to the speaker, and therefore lack also spatial deictics that relate to the speaker's location within the space.[27] They are a more equal combination than either memory spaces or purely fictional spaces of reproductive imagining of a collective memory—myth—and productive imagining of novel elements. In this way, Sappho creates unique spaces while at the same time situating them within the larger mythical context.

Mythic spaces are perhaps the easiest to identify, since they must contain references to myth, and are found in a number of Sappho's poems. Sappho often gives her own take on the events of Homeric myth, as in frs. 44 and 16 below.

Fragment 44 is our longest extant example of Sappho's work that relates an event from myth, in this case, the arrival of Andromache and Hector in Troy. The messenger speech in the beginning of the fragment introduces the occasion:

> Ἔκτωρ καὶ συνέταιρ[ο]ι ἄγοις᾽ ἐλικώπιδα
> Θήβας ἐξ ἱέρας Πλακίας τ᾽ ἀ [π᾽ ἀι]ν <ν>άω
> ἄβραν Ἀνδρομάχαν ἐνὶ ναῦσιν ἐπ᾽ ἄλμυρον
> πόντον· πόλλα δ᾽ [ἐλί]γματα χρύσια κἄμματα

[27] D'Alessio 2004: 239 briefly touches on the deictic shift between the mythical past and the time of performance: "Mythical time is merged with the time of the performance, and the myth is re-enacted in a rite, accompanied by the processional song" as in Sappho 140 *V* and Pindar *Pae.* 15.

πορφύρ[α] καταῦτ[με]να, ποίκιλ᾽ ἀθύρματα,
ἀργύρα τ᾽ ἀνάριθμα ποτήρια κἀλέφαις (5–10)

‘Hector and his companions are bringing from
holy Thebe and ever-flowing Plakia
lively-eyed, graceful Andromache in their ships over the salty
sea; and many golden bracelets and perfumed
purple robes, ornate trinkets,
and innumerable silver drinking-cups and ivory’

The physical detail of the gifts provides building blocks for the imagination to construct ships laden with treasures while the messenger’s direct speech works to bring the event to life in the present performance. In the remainder of the fragment a vibrant cityscape is constructed as the Trojans prepare to welcome Andromache and Hector. The speaker describes the movement of people throughout the city as they yoke and board carriages. The use of the aorist—ἀνόρουσε (11) and ἦλθε (12)—and imperfect—ἄγον (14), ἐπέβαινε (14), and ὔπαγον (17)—establishes these actions as part of the mythical past. The space of the city is further filled in with various sights, sounds, and smells:

αὖλος δ᾽ ἀδυ[μ]έλης [κίθαρίς] τ᾽ ὀνεμίγνυ[το
καὶ ψ[ό]φο[ς κ]ροτάλ[ων, λιγέ]ως δ᾽ ἄρα πάρ[θενοι
ἄειδον μέλος ἄγν[ον, ἵκα]νε δ᾽ ἐς αἴθ[ερα
ἄχω θεσπεσία γελ[πάνται δ᾽ ᾗς κὰτ ὅδο[ις
κράτηρες φίαλαί τ᾽ ὀ[. . .]υεδε[. .] . . εακ[.] . [
μύρρα καὶ κασία λίβανός τ᾽ ὀνεμείχνυτο·
γύναικες δ᾽ ἐλέλυσδον ὅσαι προγενέστερα[ι,
πάντες δ᾽ ἄνδρες ἐπήρατον ἴαχον ὄρθιον
Πάον᾽ ὀνκαλέοντες ἐκάβολον εὐλύραν,
ὕμνην δ᾽ Ἕκτορα κ᾽ Ανδρομάχαν θεοεικέλο[ις (24–34)

and the sweet-sounding aulos and (kithara) were mingling
and the sound of clappers, and clearly did *parthenoi*
sing a holy song, and a divine-sounding echo
reached to the sky and all down the streets…
mixing-bowls and drinking-cups…
myrrh and cassia and frankincense were mingled;
and the older women made ululations
and all the men sounded forth a lovely high-pitched song

> calling on Paean, the ready archer skilled in the lyre,
> and they sang in praise of godlike Hector and Andromache

These descriptions, as with most purely fictional spaces, take the place of real sensory input to bring this scene from myth to life in the mythic space, creating a full and vibrant synesthetic experience for listeners.[28] The particular reference to choral activities—the singing of the *parthenoi*, older women, and men—adds depth to the space and, whether fr. 44 was choral or monodic, an interesting parallel or contrast to the performance itself.[29]

Wolfgang Rösler argues that the emphasis on the role of the audience in the myth—the preparation of the procession, the festivities—invites the audience to imagine themselves as part of the myth:

> [F]allen bei Sappho Realität und Mythos zusammen. Die Zuhörer erleben das, was im Lied auf der Ebene des Mythos dargestellt ist, zur gleichen Zeit als reales Geschehen (Rösler 1975: 285).
>
> [I]n Sappho reality and myth coincide. The listeners experience that which in the song is represented on the level of myth at the same time as they do the real event.

The speaker adds more and more detail to her description of the mythic space until it has grown into an imagining of past events so vibrant that it draws the audience in.[30] If the speaker makes any reference to herself, it does not survive; nor do any spatial deictic markers to connect the mythic space to the real performance context. This mythic space is constructed, as far as we can tell from what is extant, only by reference to the marriage of Andromache and Hector.

---

[28] See Ladianou 2016 and Bierl 2016 for more discussion of the synesthetic quality of Sappho's spaces.

[29] Ladianou 2016: 347–50 and 362 argues that the choral quality of the visualization and synesthesia in this fragment point towards choral rather than monodic performance. Or perhaps, by embedding a choral performance in monodic song, it adds a "parachoral" quality as Power 2019, especially 106, suggests.

[30] Rösler 1975 follows Merkelbach 1957 in arguing that fr. 44 is a wedding song, and as such the identification of the real audience with the audience of the myth is strengthened by their shared context: "Durch die Betonung der Rolle des mythischen Publikums ist das Publikum der aktuellen Hochzeit in die höhere Realität des Mythos miteinbezogen" (282). Caliva 2019 also sees the shared marital context as a connection "meant to blur the temporal distinctions between the two points and thus to make what was true *then* the reality of *now*" (431).

I have already discussed fr. 16 in terms of memory space, but it is more well-known for its depiction of Helen. Here Sappho proceeds as she often does, providing a different angle on a Homeric myth:

> o]ἰ μὲν ἰππήων στρότον οἰ δὲ πέσδων
> οἰ δὲ νάων φαῖσ᾽ ἐπ[ὶ] γᾶν μέλαι[ν]αν
> ἔ]μμεναι κάλλιστον, ἔγω δὲ κῆν᾽ ὅτ-
> τω τις ἔραται·
> πά]γχυ δ᾽ εὔμαρες σύνετον πόησαι
> π]άντι τ[ο]ῦτ᾽, ἀ γὰρ πόλυ περσκέθοισα
> κάλλος [ἀνθ]ρώπων Ἐλένα [τὸ]ν ἄνδρα
> τὸν [πανάρ]ιστον
> καλλ[ίποι]σ᾽ ἔβα ᾽ς Τροΐαν πλέοι[σα
> κωὐδ[ὲ πα]ῖδος οὐδὲ φίλων το[κ]ήων
> πά[μπαν] ἐμνάσθη, ἀλλὰ παράγαγ᾽ αὔταν (1–11)
>
> some men say a host of cavalry, others of infantry,
> and others of ships is the most beautiful thing
> on the black earth, but I say it is that thing, whatever
> someone loves;
> and it is altogether easy to make this
> intelligible to everyone, for she who far surpassed
> mankind in beauty, Helen, leaving behind
> her most noble
> husband went sailing to Troy
> and neither her child nor her dear parents
> did she remember at all, but… led her astray…

There is much to be said about the particulars of Sappho's depiction of Helen and her agency in the events surrounding her departure.[31] The allusion to Helen sets off a small mythic space, in which her departure is brought into the present and we are to imagine Helen leaving her family behind to sail to Troy. Much like a memory space, this mythic space is constructed in the past with the aorist indicatives ἔβα (9) and ἐμνάσθη (11), and the lack of detail suggests that we should be able to construct this space based on prior knowledge of Helen. More novel is the

[31] See, e.g., Rosenmeyer 1998 or Whitmarsh 2018 for some interesting takes on Helen's character.

implication that Helen leaves in order to pursue what she deems κάλλιστον, which adds more depth to the space than the simple description of her departure initially suggests.

When the speaker continues on to say that she has been reminded "now" (15–16: . .]με νῦν Ἀνακτορί[ας ὀ]νέμναις᾽ / οὐ] παρεοίσας) of the absent Anaktoria, as I have discussed above in section 3, the distinction between the speaker's purely fictional present space, the memory space of Anaktoria, and the mythic space of Helen are marked as separate and yet oddly connected. Eva Stehle argues that Sappho presents her longing for Anaktoria in fr. 16 as a "continuation and completion" of Helen's story, thus merging the speaker's—Sappho's—past with the mythical past. In this way Stehle sees Sappho as "blurring" myth and memory while keeping them separate from "now." Stehle carries this connection through Sappho's entire corpus, painting all her past interactions with Aphrodite, which I consider to be memory spaces, as "continuous with the time of myth," taking for example fr. 96 (Stehle 2009):

> Sappho shows us the woman as she lives both in the seductive 'once' of those who remember and fantasize about her (myth and memory blurred) and in her own painful 'now.'

It is unclear to me why the past of the woman in fr. 96 must be mythic, as Stehle offers no definition to separate myth from simple memory, other than to support Stehle's ultimate argument that

> [t]ogether the poems seem to outline a temporal sequence: mythic plenitude in an indefinite past, song recreating or requesting renewal of that (imaginary) plenitude in the present, and immortality in hero-cult, figuratively or literally, in the future, based on the power of the singer's song and by analogy with Tithonos (Stehle 2009).

I find the connection Stehle argues in fr. 16 too tenuous to thread through all of Sappho's work and am hesitant to ascribe mythic status to all past tense use in Sappho as Stehle seems to. While I acknowledge some overlap and slippage between the categories I have created, mythic space

and memory space by my criteria have unique characteristics that set them apart from one another, namely that the former has clear reference to mythic figures and the latter does not. The presence of a deity should not restrict time to the mythic past—otherwise what are we to make of the speaker in fr. 2 calling for Aphrodite in the present time? Aphrodite's presence is well suited to the context of the fictional space, which the speaker describes as containing a temple. For the purposes of this paper, myth and memory will remain separate.

Fragment 16 contains examples of all three kinds of spaces—memory space in lines 15–18, mythic space in lines 6–11, and purely fictional space in between—and is perhaps the best suited to show off their similarities and differences. The fictional space of the speaker's present transitions smoothly into the mythic space of Helen, which in turn reminds the speaker of Anaktoria and thus the memory space is constructed. The speaker, Helen, and Anaktoria exist in their own respective spaces and times, and yet are inextricably tied to one another and to the time and space of the performance. Both the mythic and memory spaces are imaginings of a past time, but Helen's is less personal, a well-known story. The space of Anaktoria, on the other hand, is clearly marked as a memory by the verb ἀναμιμνήσκω (15: . .]με νῦν Ἀνακτορί[ας ὀ]νέμναις'). These two spaces, though flowing into one another, are clearly separated, particularly by the juxtaposition of forgetting in Helen's space and remembering in Anaktoria's. To move between all three spaces requires listeners to quickly adapt, modifying the space they have imagined to fit the speaker's descriptions and filling in what blanks are left.

VI. CONCLUSION

I have sought in this paper to interrogate the construction of space in Sappho's poetry and its effects on listeners. The imagination, which mediates between sensory input and our experience of it, plays a vital role in our engagement with the space of poetry. To perceive is to imagine, and so our perception of the imagined space within poetry is a very real thing in which we are active participants. I have looked at the spaces of memory, pure fiction, and myth in Sappho's poetry to show the ways in which past events or the events of myth are reproduced in the present performance context by the construction of memory or mythic spaces, and how the production of novel elements enhances these other spaces or helps to form purely fictional spaces. As we have seen throughout this paper, these categories are by no means absolute and the edges between them are quite blurred; the distinctions I have made, however, make clearer the general patterns in Sappho's construction of space. I have also shown that the poetry itself—the words spoken by the speaker—and the imaginations of listeners work together in constructing space. Sappho makes use of deixis both to create distinctions between spaces within poetry and to connect those spaces to the zero degree deictic space of I, here, now at which a poem is performed.

This paper offers a new way to think about the spaces we encounter in Sappho's poetry and how we engage in their construction. Wedding songs, such as 105a, which are at once shorter and often more metaphorical, have been mostly left out of this study. The general performance context of these poems is somewhat more certain than that of the majority of Sappho's work, and therefore a study of the space within those poems would require more

careful consideration of performance context than what I have attempted here. I stand by my argument that all spaces within poetry are imaginary even if they refer to real world spaces; there is, however, far more overlap in real and imaginary space in these songs when they were being performed in context for them to be addressed here.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Bierl, Anton. 2016. "Visualizing the Cologne Sappho: Mental Imagery through Chorality, the Sun, and Orpheus." In *The Look of Lyric: Greek Song and the Visual*, ed. Vanessa Cazzato and André Lardinois, 307–42. Vol. 1 of *Studies in Archaic and Classical Greek Song*. Supplement, *Mnemosyne* 391. Leiden: Brill.

Bühler, Karl. 2011 [1934]. *Theory of Language: The Representational Function of Language*, trans. Donald F. Goodwin. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Burnett, Anne P. 1979. "Desire and Memory (Sappho Frag. 94)." *Classical Philology* 74.1: 16–27.

———. 1983. *Three Archaic Poets: Archilochus, Alcaeus, Sappho*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Calame, Claude. 2004. "Deictic Ambiguity and Auto-Referentiality: Some Examples from Greek Poetics," trans. Jenny Strauss Clay. In "The Poetics of Deixis in Alcman, Pindar, and Other Lyric," ed. Nancy Felson. Special issue, *Arethusa* 37.3: 415–43.

Caliva, Kathryn. 2019. "The Past Made Present: Mythic References and Pragmatic Effects in Sappho." *American Journal of Philology* 140.3: 415–38.

Campbell, David A., ed. and comm. 1982. *Greek Lyric, Volume I: Sappho and Alcaeus.* Loeb Classical Library 142. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Capra, Andrea. 2019. "Lyric Oblivion: When Sappho Taught Socrates How to Forget." In *Greek Memories: Theories and Practices*, ed. Luca Castagnoli and Paola Ceccarelli, 179–94. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Carson, Anne. 1986. *Eros the Bittersweet: An Essay*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

———. 2002. "Decreation: How Women Like Sappho, Marguerite Porete, and Simone Weil Tell God." *Common Knowledge* 8.1: 188–203.

Castagnoli, Luca, and Paola Ceccarelli, eds. 2019. *Greek Memories: Theories and Practices*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

D'Alessio, Giambattista. 2004. "Past Future and Present Past: Temporal Deixis in Greek Archaic Lyric." In "The Poetics of Deixis in Alcman, Pindar, and Other Lyric," ed. Nancy Felson. Special issue, *Arethusa* 37.3: 267–94.

———. 2018. "Fiction and Pragmatics in Ancient Greek Lyric: The Case of Sappho." In *Textual Events: Performance and the Lyric in Early Greece*, ed. Felix Budelmann and Tom Phillips, 31–62. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Felson, Nancy. 2004. “Introduction.” In “The Poetics of Deixis in Alcman, Pindar, and Other Lyric,” ed. Nancy Felson. Special issue, *Arethusa* 37.3: 253–66.

Ferrari, Franco. 2010 [2007]. *Sappho’s Gift: The Poet and Her Community*, trans. Benjamin Acosta-Hughes and Lucia Prauscello. Ann Arbor, MI: Michigan Classical Press.

Hallett, Judith. 1979. “Sappho and her Social Context.” *Signs* 4.3: 447–64.

Heirman, Jo. 2012. *Space in Archaic Greek Lyric: City, Countryside and Sea*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.

Hutchinson, Gregory O. 2018. “What is a Setting?” In *Textual Events: Performance and the Lyric in Early Greece*, ed. Felix Budelmann and Tom Phillips, 115–34. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Janowski, Monica, and Tim Ingold, ed. 2012. *Imagining Landscapes: Past, Present and Future*. Anthropological Studies of Creativity and Perception. Surrey, UK: Ashgate Publishing.

Ladianou, Katherine. 2016. “Female Choruses and Gardens of Nymphs: Visualizing Chorality in Sappho.” In *The Look of Lyric: Greek Song and the Visual*, ed. Vanessa Cazzato and André Lardinois, 343–69. Vol. 1 of *Studies in Archaic and Classical Greek Song*. Supplement, *Mnemosyne* 391. Leiden: Brill.

Lardinois, André. 1994. “Subject and Circumstance in Sappho’s Poetry.” *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 124: 57–84.

———. 1996. “Who Sang Sappho’s Songs?” In *Reading Sappho: Contemporary Approaches*, ed. Ellen Greene, 150–72. Berkeley: University of California Press.

———. 2001. “Keening Sappho.” In *Making Silence Speak: Women’s Voices in Greek Literature and Society*, ed. André Lardinois and Laura McClure, 75–92. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

———. 2008. “‘Someone, I say, will remember us’: Oral Memory in Sappho’s Poetry.” In *Orality, Literacy, Memory in the Ancient Greek and Roman World*, ed. E. Anne Mackay, 79–96. In Vol. 7 of *Orality and Literacy in Ancient Greece*. Supplement, *Mnemosyne* 298. Leiden: Brill.

LeVen, Pauline A. 2018. “Echo and the Invention of the Lyric Listener.” In *Textual Events: Performance and the Lyric in Early Greece*, ed. Felix Budelmann and Tom Phillips, 213–34. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Mace, Sarah T. 1993. “Amour, Encore! The Development of δηῦτε in Archaic Lyric.” *Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies* 34: 335–64.

Merkelbach, Reinhold. 1957. “Sappho und ihr Kreis.” *Philologus* 101: 1–29.

Nagy, Gregory. 2019. “Genre, Occasion, and Choral Mimesis Revisited, with Special Reference to the ‘Newest Sappho.’” In *Genre in Archaic and Classical Greek Poetry: Theories and Models*, ed. Margaret Foster, Leslie Kurke, and Naomi Weiss, 31–54. In Vol. 4 of *Studies in Archaic and Classical Greek Song*. Supplement, *Mnemosyne* 428. Leiden: Brill.

Olsen, Sarah. 2019. “Sappho’s Kinesthetic Turn: Agency and Embodiment in Archaic Greek Poetry.” In *The Routledge Handbook of Classics and Cognitive Theory*, ed. Peter Meineck, William Michael Short, and Jennifer Devereaux, 281–96. New York: Routledgee

Peponi, Anastasia-Erasmia. 2016. “Lyric Vision: An Introduction.” In *The Look of Lyric: Greek Song and the Visual*, ed. Vanessa Cazzato and André Lardinois, 1–15. Vol. 1 of *Studies in Archaic and Classical Greek Song*. Supplement, *Mnemosyne* 391. Leiden: Brill.

Power, Timothy. 2019. “Sappho’s Parachoral Monody.” In *Genre in Archaic and Classical Greek Poetry: Theories and Models*, ed. Margaret Foster, Leslie Kurke, and Naomi Weiss, 82–108. In Vol. 4 of *Studies in Archaic and Classical Greek Song*. Supplement, *Mnemosyne* 428. Leiden: Brill.

Purves, Alex C. 2014. “Who, Sappho?” In *Defining Greek Narrative*, ed. Douglas Cairns and Ruth Scodel, 176–97. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Rosenmeyer, Patricia A. 1998. “Her Master’s Voice: Sappho’s Dialogue with Homer.” *Materiali e Discussioni per l’Analisi dei Testi Classici* 39: 123–49.

Rösler, Wolfgang. 1975. “Ein Gedicht und sein Publikum: Überlegungen zu Sappho Fr. 44 Lobel-Page.” *Hermes* 103.3: 275–85.

Schmitz, Thomas A. 2013. “Erzählung und Imagination in Sapphos Aphroditelied (frg. 1 V).” In *Epos, Lyrik, Drama: Genese und Ausformung der literarischen Gattungen*, ed. Boris Dunsch, Arbogast Schmitt, and Thomas A. Schmitz, 89–103. Heidelberg: Universitätsverlag Winter.

Stehle (Stigers), Eva. 1981 “Sappho’s Private World.” *Women’s Studies: An Interdisciplinary Journal* 8.1–2: 47–63.

———. 2009. “‘Once’ and ‘Now’: Temporal Markers and Sappho’s Self-Representation.” In *The New Sappho on Old Age: Textual and Philosophical Issues*, ed. Ellen Greene and Marilyn Skinner, 118–30. Hellenic Studies Series 38. Washington, DC: Center for Hellenic Studies.

Whitmarsh, Tim. 2018. “Sappho and Cyborg Helen.” In *Textual Events: Performance and the Lyric in Early Greece*, ed. Felix Budelmann and Tom Phillips, 136–50. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Winkler, Jack J. 1981. “Gardens of Nymphs: Public and Private in Sappho’s Lyrics.” In *Reflections of Women in Antiquity*, ed. Helene P. Foley, 63–90. New York: Gordon and Breach.

Yatromanolakis, Dimitrios. 2004. “Ritual Poetics in Archaic Lesbos: Contextualizing Genre in Sappho.” In *Greek Ritual Poetics*, ed. Dimitrios Yatromanolakis and Panagiotis Roilos, 56–70. Hellenic Studies Series 3. Washington, DC: Center for Hellenic Studies.